



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. I.

No. 2.

I. ETYMOLOGICAL AND GRAMMATICAL NOTES.

I.—*Τηλουρόζ*.

Τηλουρόζ occurs twice in Aeschylus' Prometheus, and twice in Euripides, besides once in Apollonius Rhodius.¹ Its actual meaning is simply 'far,' 'remote': εἰς τηλουρόν ἤκομεν πέδον, 'into a distant land' (Prom. 1); τηλουρόν δὲ γῆν ἤξεις, 'thou shalt come to a far country' (809); τηλουρά γὰρ ναίουσ' ἀφ' ἡμῶν πεδία, 'though she dwells in plains distant from us' (Andr. 890); τηλουρός οὔσα δωμάτων, 'while I was far from the palace' (Orest. 1325); this last is the only passage which does not imply a very great distance. The current etymology of the word is 'far-bounded,' 'having distant boundaries.' Hesychius, *τηλουρόν*· πόρρω ἀφωρισμένην; Etymol. Magn., *τηλουρός*· ὁ πόρρω ἀπὸν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τηλοῦ καὶ ὄρος; and so modern dictionary-makers, including W. Dindorf (Lexicon Aeschyleum).

The accent of the word is against this. Compounds of this sort, ending in -ος, accent the ultima or a short penult only when the latter part of the compound has an active sense, as doer or agent: so *λιθο-βόλος*, 'stone-thrower,' distinguished from *λιθό-βουλος*, 'pelted with stones'; *νεο-τόχος*, 'having lately brought forth,' but *νεό-τοκος*, 'new born.' And possessive compounds in -ος are always, or almost always, accented recessively. Our word, therefore, if really a compound of *ὄρος* (*ὄδρος*), 'boundary,' ought

¹ Argonautica 2, 544: οὐδὲ τις αἶα τηλουρός.

to be *τηλουργος*, or at least *τηλοῦρος*.¹ Lycophron, indeed, uses *ἀγχούρος*, and its accent as properispomenon is expressly attested by Herodian. And *τηλοῦρος* has been written, it would seem, even in ancient times; for the Hesychian gloss above quoted goes on, *τινὲς μὲν ὡς παανοῦργον, τινὲς δὲ ὡς κηπουρόν τῷ τόνῳ*, and then comes a second gloss, *τηλοῦρος· μακρόθεν ἀποθείς*. Of modern scholars Reisig wished to write *τηλοῦρος*. But the testimony of Herodian must be considered final as to the accent. He cites it as oxytone, along with *οἰκουρός* and *κηπουρός*.² This fact makes very strongly against the etymology in question, especially as the supposed idea of 'boundaries' by no means necessarily lies in the word. I can think of only one way in which a deviation like this from the normal accentuation could be accounted for. Supposing that all, or nearly all other words in *-ουρος* were oxytone, this one word standing by itself might, we can conceive, be drawn into the analogy of the rest. We shall have, I think, to conclude that this has happened in the case of some words in *-ωπος* to be hereafter discussed. But even that resource seems to fail us here. For although there are four or five other oxytones in *-ουρός*, there are, on the other hand, *πρόσουρος* (Soph.), *ἄπουρος* (Soph.), *ὑμουρος* (Hdt.), to say nothing of the late *ἀγχούρος*,³ and of *σκίουρος*, *κέρκουρος*, *ἀρκτοῦρος*, and others. These would have protected a **τηλοῦρος* or **τήλουρος* from any influence of false analogy.

Hartung regarded *τηλουρός* as a derivative merely, not a compound, and in this he is followed by Wecklein. According to them⁴ it is formed from *τηλοῦ* as *τολμηρός* from *τόλμη*, and *πυνηρός* from *πύνη*. This is by no means convincing. For *τηλοῦ* is genitive of an obsolescent noun-stem *τηλο-*, whence *τηλό-θεν*, *τηλό-θι*, *τηλοῖ*, *τηλο-τέρω*, *τηλο-τάτω*. And what is a derivative suffix doing behind a genitive case? Suffixes should be added to stems, not cases. To the grammar of the last generation there was, of course, nothing strange in the idea of an adjective derived from an adverb,

¹ The oldest (inscriptional) form of *ὅρος*, 'boundary,' is *ὄρφος*. Its etymology is unknown. As no initial consonant can be proved for it, it seems that we should have to suppose **τήλ-ορφος*, proparoxytone, to start with; then **τήλ-ουρος* (cp. *ἄπ-ουρος*, *ὄμ-ουρος*); so that the accentuation *τηλοῦρος*, *ἀγχούρος*, remains after all unexplained.

² Lenz I, p. 202, I. 7.

³ *τετρωρος* in the Heracleian Tables, C. I. G. 5764, 5775, is also a compound of *ὅρος*, but of course there is no tradition about its accent.

⁴ On Prom. I.

and our dictionaries are full of such derivations yet. But I do not know of a single clear case of the sort. Adverbs are *fossilized* cases, so to speak, of dead (or living) nouns. And where derivatives exist, they are formed, as they should be, from the stems of these nouns. An instance or two will illustrate my meaning. *Μάταιος*, any one can see, is not from *μάτην*, but from the stem *ματα-* of the old noun *μάτη*, which is still rarely used. But just so *ἀνταῖος* is not from the adverb *ἄντα*, as such, but from the stem *ἀντα-*, which survives in *ἄντην*-, and would appear, as a noun, to be not quite extinct. And *χρυφαῖος*, *ἡρεμαῖος*, *λαθραῖος* are likewise to be understood, not as from *χρόφα*, *ἡρέμα*, *λάθρα* outright, but as from dead stems *χρυφα-*, *ἡρεμα*, *λαθρα-*. The relation of *αἰψηρός* to *αἰψα* is probably not different. The adverb *χαμαί* makes no adjective, but its stem *χαμα-* (also in *χαμαῖ-θεν*, *χαμά-δεις*, *χαμαῖ-ξες*) makes *χαμηλός*. And—passing to adverbs like *τηλοῦ*—*όμοῦ* and *ὕψοῦ* can form no derivatives, but their stems *όμο-* and *ὕψο-* (compare *ὕψό-θεν*, *ὕψό-θι*, *ὕψοι*, *ὕψό-σε*, *ὕψο-τάτω*) give rise to *όμοτος* and *ὕψηλός*. Now just so, if an adjective corresponding to *τηλοῦ* had been wanted, it would have been formed from the stem *τηλο-*; and if formed in *-ρός* it could have been nothing else than **τηληρός*, as *πονηρός* from *πονο-*, *νοσηρός* from *νοσο-*, and more than forty others.

I think it probable that *τηλουρός* is a compound, not of *ὅρος*, 'boundary,' but of *ὄρος*, *οἶδος*, in compounds also *-ωρος*—originally *φόρος*—'watcher,' 'looker,' and is formed exactly like *οἰκουρός*, 'house-guardian,' and *κηπουρός*, 'garden-watcher,' the words along with which Herodian cites it; to which may be added *ἐρκουρός* (late), 'fence-watcher'; also *πυλωρός*, *πυλα-ωρός* (*πυλα-φόρος*), 'gate-keeper,' and *θυρωρός*, *ἀρκυωρός*, *σκευωρός*, *φρυγτωρός*, as well as *τιμωρός*, *τιμá-ορος* (*τιμα-φόρος*) 'honor-guardian,' 'avenger.'¹ Accordingly, **τηλε-φόρος* (or **τηλο-φόρος*), meaning primarily 'watching from afar,' and so 'looming up in the distance,' and applied first, let us imagine, to a tree or mountain on the distant horizon; then by use the meaning might fade, perhaps, into 'seen in the distance,' and then merely 'distant.' An inkling of this etymology may have lurked in the mind of a scholiast on Prom. 1., who defines the word, ἀφ' οὗ τῆλε καὶ μακρὰν ὁρᾶν τις δύναται,

¹ All these words must have shifted the accent to the ultima after contraction, in order to conform to the rule which prescribes that compounds of this class shall be oxytone if they have a long penult. At the outset **πυλα-φόρος*, etc. (like *σκευνο-φόρος*), must be assumed. The accent of *τιμá-ορος* is to me inexplicable.

that is, 'affording a distant view,' which is certainly a wrong turn, at least for the passage in question, but shows perhaps some notion of the original meaning.

If this transition of meaning seems harsh, it may be observed that we have a close parallel in the Sophoclean *τηλωπός*. It means, as used, simply 'far'; *τηλωπός οίχνεϊ*, 'he is gone far away' (Ai. 564); *βοᾷ τηλωπὸν ἰωάν*, 'he utters a shout from afar,' or 'penetrating far.' The original meaning must have been, not 'seen from afar' (Liddell and Scott), 'e longinquo conspicuus' (Dindorf), '*μακρόθεν φαινόμενον*' (Hesychius), but rather 'far-seeing,' 'fern schauend' (Pape), like *σκυθρωπός*, 'gloomy-looking,' and plenty more. But 'far looking' can pass without much trouble into 'far visible'; for whatever looms up so as to see us, that we can see in turn; and, finally, can come to mean simply 'far,' without reference to vision.

These adjectives in *-ωπός* demand a word in passing. Most of them are generally taken as containing ὤψ, 'face,' 'eye.' But their accent again is not what we look for in possessive compounds, and suggests rather an active verbal *-ωπό-ς*, 'looking.' Now, a good many of the words in question admit this explanation just as easily as the other, and some seem to require it. *Τηλωπός* seems a clear case of this, for 'far-eyed' or 'far-faced' would not give much sense. So too:

πυρωπός: *ξεραυνός* (Prom. 667), 'fiery-looking,' 'fire-glancing' lightning, better than 'fire-eyed.'

φλογωπὸν πῦρ (Prom. 253), 'flame-looking,' 'flaming.'

ἀντωπός: *ἀντωποῖς βλέφαροις* (Iph. A. 584), 'eyes that looked him face to face.'

γοργωπός: *γοργωπὸν σέλας* (ἐξ ὀμμάτων, Prom. 356), 'fierce-glaring' flame; *γοργωποῦς κόρας* (H. F. 868), 'fierce-flashing' eyes; better than 'fierce-visaged.' So:

ἄγριωπὸν ὄμμα (H. F. 990), 'wild-looking.'

φαιδρωπὸν ὄμμα (Orest. 894), 'cheerful-looking.'

σκυθρωπὸν ὄμμα (Phoen. 1333), 'gloomy-looking.'

ἀστερωπὸν ὄμμα *Λητώας κόρης* (Aesch. Fr. 164 N.), 'star looking,' 'star-like.' But *ἀστερωπὸς αἰθήρ* (Ion. 1080), 'starry' firmament.

αἱματωπὸς κόρας (Orest. 256), 'bloody-looking,' 'blood-shot' eyes (*αἷμα βλέπούσας*, Hesych.). In *αἱματωπὸν δεργμάτων διαφθοραί* (Phoen. 870, of Oedipus) it does not necessarily mean 'bloody-eyed'; we can translate 'the bloody mutilation of his eyes.'

In these cases the supposed active meaning seems to me preferable. Observe that in the last two ('starry,' 'bloody') the meaning has begun to fade out much as in *τηλωπός*. This fading has gone further in:

κοιλωπός ἄγμός (Iph. T. 263), 'hollow-looking,' and so practically 'hollow'; and

νυκτερωπός: *δόχημα νυκτερωπὸν ἐννύχων ὀνείρων* (Herc. F. 111), merely a 'nocturnal' vision. Perhaps also in *στεινωπός* (Homer), 'narrow-looking,' and so 'narrow'; to which Euripides has the counterpart in *χάσμα ἐδρωπὸν πέτρας* (Iph. T. 626), a 'wide' crevice. However, a different understanding of these two is possible.

Others are less decisive so far as meaning goes: *δεινωπός* (Hes. Scut. 250, of the *Κήρες*), *τερατωπός* (Hymn. Hom. 19, 36, of Pan), *μυωπός*, *οἰνωπός*, *μαρμαρωπός*, *μορμορωπός*, *εἰσωπός*. Yet their accent affords a presumption in favor of the active sense.

On the other hand, one or two resist this interpretation. For even if we can understand *παρθενωπός* (Eur. Elec. 948) as 'girlish-looking' rather than 'girl-faced,' and *ἀμβλωπός* (*δακρύων βίον ἀμβλωπὸν*, Eum. 955) as 'dim-looking' rather than 'dim-eyed,' still the *μυριωπός βούτας* (Argos) of Prom. 569 cannot be other than 'many-eyed.' Not less certainly have we a possessive compound in *δικτύω πολυωπῶ* (Od. γ 386), which seems to contain an *ὥπη 'hole,' equivalent to *ὀπή*. And it is possible to take *στεινωπός* and *ἐδρωπός* in a similar way, as Vaniček does, though to me this does not recommend itself.

Respecting these words in *-ωπός*, the most probable view, so far as I now see, is that the mass of them were compounds of an active *-ωπό-ς*, and so oxytone; and that the few other compounds of like termination, which should have had recessive accent, were drawn into the analogy of the rest.

2.—*θεωρός*.

This word has received a variety of interpretations.

1. From *θεός* and *ῥα* or *-ωρός*: 'god-watcher,' 'caring for the god.' Hesychius: *θεωροί· οἱ φροντίζοντες περὶ τὰ θεῖα*: and so most ancients and moderns have taken it.

2. Pollux 2, 55: *ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς θεὸν ὀρούειν* (!), 'hastener to a god.'

3. From *θέα* and *ῥα*, *-ωρός*: "mit der *ῥα* der *θέα* (spectandi cura) betraut: wonicht gesteigert; die *θέα* (eifrig) wahrnehmend, d. h. ausführend"; Pott Etym. Forsch. II 3, 584, doubtingly.

4. As no compound at all, but a mere derivative from $\theta\acute{\epsilon}a$; 'one who has to do with a spectacle.' So Curtius, followed by Vaniček.

Which of these is right ought not to be a matter of doubt. The first explanation falls to the ground by reason of the Doric form $\theta\epsilon\bar{a}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$,¹ as Ahrens, Dor. p. 182, rightly says. The second requires no serious notice. The fourth is refuted by the lack of all analogy for the ω in $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$. There is not a single derivative in $-\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$; on the contrary, the very numerous formations with suffix $-\rho\omega-$ from $a-$ and $o-$ stems have mostly the form $-\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, as $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\lambda\upsilon\pi\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, and about forty others (but $\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\bar{a}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ from $\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha$); a few end in $-\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, as $\sigma\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\varphi\omicron\beta\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$; still fewer in $-\bar{\alpha}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, as $\nu\epsilon\bar{\alpha}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$. Accordingly, from $\theta\acute{\epsilon}a$ we might have Doric and Attic $\theta\epsilon\bar{a}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, Ionic $\theta\epsilon\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, but never $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$.

Pott's idea is the only one that meets the case. From $*\theta\epsilon\bar{a}-\mathcal{F}\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ we should get by the regular contraction $\theta\epsilon\bar{a}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Doric, $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Attic. The only question is whether the original meaning is really 'overseer of a spectacle,' and not rather 'onlooker at a spectacle,' according to Pott's second thought. For this latter speaks the use of $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Choeph. 246 ($\mathcal{Z}\epsilon\bar{\nu}$, $\mathcal{Z}\epsilon\bar{\nu}$, $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ τῶνδε πραγμάτων γενῶν), and two other places in Aeschylus, where it means simply 'spectator,' $\theta\epsilon\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$; also the prevailing use of $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$.

The objection which Ahrens (l. c.) makes to this derivation has little weight. It is true that $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\omicron\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ is in Doric $\theta\bar{a}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\rho\mu\alpha\iota$; nevertheless the noun $*\theta\bar{a}\acute{\alpha}$ might have been lightened to $\theta\acute{\epsilon}a$, even in Doric itself. And in any case $*\theta\bar{a}\bar{a}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ would be too clumsy to have maintained itself.

3.— $\mathcal{H}\omicron\iota\mathcal{F}\acute{\epsilon}\omega$.

In an old Argive inscription recently discovered at Olympia occurs the form $E\mathcal{P}\theta\mathcal{I}\mathcal{F}E\Box E$; that is, $\xi\pi\omicron\iota\mathcal{F}\eta\acute{\epsilon}=\xi\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon$. The appearance of \mathcal{F} in this word I have not seen accounted for. E. Curtius, who edited the inscription in the *Archaeologische Zeitung* xxxiv (1876), 1, was puzzled by it, and Cauer in his *Delectus Inscriptionum* cannot explain it: "nam quamquam in stirpe verbi $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$ $\mathcal{P}u$ radix latere videtur . . . tamen in ea tale vestigium υ vocalis servatum esse non crediderim"; and he thinks it may have arisen "depravata pronuntiatione." But it does not seem needful to resort to this last supposition. $\mathcal{H}\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ is a derivative verb from $-\pi\omicron\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$ ($\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron-\pi\omicron\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{o}\pi\lambda\omicron-\pi\omicron\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$). Whether with G. Curtius we refer this to root $\mathcal{P}u$, 'beget' (cp. $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\omicron-\pi\omicron\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\bar{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma$), or with

¹ Also Elean, as we see from the long Elean inscription lately discovered.

Vaniček and others to root *ku*, 'beat,' 'hammer,' we must in either case suppose **ποF-ιό-ς* and from it **ποF-ιξ-ω*. Hence to **ποιFός*, *ποιFξω* is an easy step: the epenthesis just as in *μοῖρα* for **μόρ-ια*, and countless other cases. I do not suppose it would be easy to show another case of epenthesis with *vau*, but as it can be proved for almost every other consonant, and is most common with the continuants, there is nothing strange in it here. I take it that in most cases where *Fι* came together (**εἰνόF-ια*, **γάF-ια*, etc.) the *F* disappeared before the epenthesis had time to set in, but we have only to suppose that the Argive dialect held to the consonant in this word with a little extra tenacity.

4.—*Δαίφρων*.

It may seem almost presumptuous to offer anything about this much-discussed Homeric word; yet I cannot help thinking that just the right view of it has been hitherto missed. The case stands briefly thus:

From the ancients we have two interpretations: one, 'experienced,' 'skillful,' based on a derivation from *δαῖναι*; the other, 'valiant,' 'warlike,' referring the compound to *δαί* (dative), 'battle,' 'fray.' Modern scholars are divided between these two interpretations. Thus, Nitzsch, Autenrieth, Düntzer favor the former; Wolf, Hermann, Ameis, the latter; while Buttmann (*Lexilogus* 1, p. 200) laid it down, as is well known, that the word has the one meaning in the *Iliad* (except the last book), and the other in the *Odyssey* and *Il. Q*, and that so there are two *δαίφρων*'s.

Buttmann was undeniably right in asserting a difference in usage. In the *Iliad* the epithet is applied as follows (I rely on Ebeling's *Lexicon*): to Achilles, six times; Diomedes, four times; Tydeus, three times; Aias, twice; Atreus, twice; Bellerophontes, twice; Priam, four times; Antimachos, twice; Odysseus, Idomeneus, Antilochos, Meriones, Peneleos, Cebriones, Peleus, Aeneas, Pandaros, Socos, Hip-pasos, Phorcys, each once. In every case to a warrior; for even Priam and Antimachos, who do not appear outright as such in the field, are yet princes who have, as a matter of course, seen their fighting days. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus is called *δαίφρων* nine times, and Alcinoo four times, Orsilocho and Anchialos each once; so, too, Polybos, a suitor; and another Polybos, father of Eurymachos: these are princes, and may be counted as warriors by implication, but less easily can Telemachos (*δ* 687) be considered so, and still less Polybos, an artificer of the Phaeacians (*θ* 373), and Anticlea,

the wife of Laertes (ο 356). Even Penelope was formerly called *δαΐφρων* instead of *περίφρων* in some copies at least, as we know from Eustathius and the scholiasts. And similarly in the Hymn to Demeter 359 we have *δαΐφρονι Περσεφονείῃ*. Finally, in Ω 325, Idaios, the charioteer of Priam, is *δαΐφρων*.

All this is hardly fortuitous, and goes to show that in the later epos the word had altered its meaning somehow, so as to be applicable to unwarlike personages, even women. But every one must see the difficulty of supposing, as Buttmann does, that we have two words of different origin. Are we to think, Nitzsch pertinently asks, that by *Ὀδυσῆα δαΐφρονα ποικιλομήτην*, Λ 482, any different Odysseus is meant from the one so described in η 168? On the other hand, it is not easy to get along with either interpretation alone. Those who hold to the derivation from *δαῖναι* apply it to warriors as 'skilled,' 'tried' in war, *δεδαηχότες ἀλκῆν*, but they do not show why in the Iliad it is applied to this kind of skill only, but to others in the Odyssey. Those again who think 'battle-minded' to be the original force are obliged to assume a very great change in meaning, so that the epithet as given to women shall signify no more than 'wacker' (Wolf) or 'spirited.'

Formally, neither derivation is, so far as I am prepared to say, impossible; yet it is to be observed that neither furnishes exactly the right stem *δαϊ-* for the first part of the compound. A noun-stem *δα-ϊ-*, from root *δα-*, 'learn,' is not only unknown but in some degree improbable. Rather the stubborn hiatus in *δαΐφρων* points to a lost consonant. The other derivation furnishes this consonant, for the Homeric dative *δαΐ*, 'battle,' stands without doubt for *δαF-ι*. But even this word gives us only a stem *δαF-*, not *δαFι-*.¹ It is true that the assumption of such a stem would be easy; *δαΐ* would then be to *δαΐ-φρων* as dative *ἀλκί* to *ἀλκί-φρων*.

But there is no need to assume a stem *δαFι-* at all when we have it right at hand in another word, which furnishes, it seems to me, a very fitting meaning for the epithet in question. This is the word *δαΐς*, plural *δαΐδες*. As used, the word means 'torch,' but its older meaning was presumably anything burning, 'firebrand,' 'blaze,' 'fire.' Its root is *du-*, *δαF*, 'kindle.' Indeed, it is almost certain that *δαΐ*, 'battle,' (compare *δῆϊος* and *μάχη πόλεμός τε δέδθεν*) is from the same root, and meant only the 'blaze' of battle; so that 'battle' would be after all only a metaphorical sense, unlikely to be used in

¹ The late accusative *δαΐν* (Callimachus) may, I take it, be left out of account.

a compound. That the δ in stems in $-t\delta-$ is only an accessory sound, is well known; so $\delta aFt-$, not $\delta aFt\delta-$, is the oldest form of the stem.

We get, therefore, 'fiery-hearted' as the probable meaning of $\delta a\iota-\varphi\rho\omega\nu$, and this sense, we may suppose, was still fully alive in the Iliad. From this it is no great transition to 'high-souled,' 'spirited,' 'gallant'; and this, I think, is about the meaning of the word in the Odyssey and the Homeric Hymn. Pindar uses it of Alcmena, Pyth. 9, 148.

5.—*Siremps*.

Siremps, an old Latin legal term, means 'just so.' Usually in the connexion *siremps lex esto*, 'let the law be just so.' The fuller form *sirempse* occurs in the prologue to Plautus's Amphitruo, 73. Neglecting older and less successful attempts to explain the word, we have explanations from Ritschl¹ and Corssen.² Ritschl, regarding *sī-* rightly as *sī-c* without its *c*—the locative of the pronoun-stem *so-*—takes the whole as *sī rē pse*, 'so in very fact,' whence *sīrepse*;³ and he looks upon the *m* as a mere 'phonetic' insertion, like that in *rumpo* and *cumbo*. But the *m* in these words is not phonetic merely, but an organic addition to form the present stem, and the supposed insertion, between two words, is not very credible. Corssen does a little better, assuming *sī rem pse*, *rem* being the accusative of 'specification.' But what has this strengthening particle *pse*, which elsewhere attaches itself only to pronouns, to do after *rem*, a substantive? **Sī-pse* would be very conceivable, but hardly *sī-rem-pse*. We cannot fancy any **res-pse*, **rei-pse*. I take the word rather as *sī rem eampse*, 'thus in very fact.' *Eampse* is a known form (Plaut. Men. 772 and elsewhere): *m* in *rem* would be lost in this situation, and the three vowels, *e^mea* would readily contract into one.

6.—*Macte virtute esto*.

Macte in the few places where it occurs in verse before a consonant shows a short final ϵ ; Verg. Aen. 9, 641, *mactē nova virtute*, and twice in Statius.⁴ This, I suppose, is the reason why we

¹ Rhein. Mus. 8, p. 303.

² Ausspr. II, 847.

³ This form really occurs (along with *siremse*) in a passage of Charisius, but is probably nothing more than a scribe's error.

⁴ Two passages in early tragedies, Att. v. 305 R. and Inc. inc. v. 231 R. (*macte Pelopiis* and *macte nitier*), are indecisive from the nature of the metre.

have all been taught that it is a vocative, and that in the phrases *macte virtute esto* and the like, it is used somehow irregularly or exceptionally for the nominative. This has been understood in two somewhat different ways. First, it has been looked on as an instance of attraction out of the nominative case into the vocative. So, among others, Reisig, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, 346, who puts it thus: "indem ein prädicat in einem satze, statt in dem nominativ gestellt zu sein, in dem vocativ steht, weil der satz an jemand gerichtet ist, auf welchen das prädicat bezogen wird." And as the standard Greek illustration of this, Theocritus 17, 66, ὄλβιε χοῦρε γένοιο, is always brought forward, which really does, at first view, seem a striking parallel to *macte virtute esto*. But the correspondence lessens on inspection. Theocritus's phrase is a bold and exceptional attraction, even for the Greek, which admits attraction of case so freely. The two or three other Greek passages which are cited as having the vocative by attraction are less abruptly peculiar.¹ But the Latin language is much less flexible in such matters, and the expression in question is an old and well-established phrase, not the bold venture of a poet. Then, too, in these Greek passages there is a vocative² close at hand to exert the attraction; in the Latin phrase there is often no vocative at all. Nor do the other instances of the like attraction in Latin stand on the same footing with *macte esto*. The most noteworthy are Hor. Sat. 2, 6, 20, *Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis*; Pers. 3, 27, *stemmae quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis, censoremve tuum vel quod trabeate salutas*; Tibull. 1, 7, 53, *sic venias hodie*. Add Val. Flac. 4, 467.³ In these cases, it is clear, the vocative is not merely an address, it stands also for what should be a nominative in agreement with the subject of the verb. But it is equally clear that in these isolated passages we

¹ Soph. Ai. 694, ὦ Πάν, Πάν, ἀλέπλαγκτε . . . φάνηθι, and Aesch. Suppl. 535, γενοῦ πολυμνᾶστορ, ἔφαπτορ Ἰοῦς, are the chief instances. Soph. Phil. 760, Eur. Tro. 1221 cannot count (see Lobeck on Ai. l. c.), because the participle which here stands as copula is itself vocative, so that we have simple agreement rather than attraction. But ἀντὶ γὰρ ἐκλήθης Ἰμβρασε Παρθενίου, in a verse of Callimachus (Schol. Ap. Rh. 2, 866), goes beyond all these in boldness.

² Except in the fragment of Callimachus: see last foot-note.

³ Verg. Aen. 2, 283, 10, 327, Val. Flac. 1, 391, do not belong here. Nor do Catull. 75, 1, *Rufe mihi frustra . . . credite amice*; and Prop. 2, 12, 2, *lectule deliciis facte beate meis*: there is no attraction, only the normal agreement of cases.

are dealing not with a native idiom of the Latin language, but with a finality of expression which poets here and there imitated from equally exceptional expressions in Greek poetry. And the models for these Latin passages were no doubt found in the artificial Alexandrine poetry, as for instance the sample quoted from Callimachus.

A somewhat different view of the supposed vocative is that which regards *macte* as a sort of *fixed* or *petrified* case, no longer felt distinctly as vocative. In this sense Neue, Lateinische Formenlehre, II, p. 99, treats of it among the *adjectiva indeclinabilia*. See also Zumpt's Grammar, § 103. The idea would be that starting from a vocative *macte* it would have lost its force as a case of address, and so become somehow capable of standing for other cases. But it is very difficult to see how the first beginnings could have been made of using a vocative in construction with the predicate of a sentence. That the vocative should become a mere exclamation is natural enough: so *macte virtute!* but *macte virtute esto* would be conceivable only as a sort of mixture of two phrases, *macte virtute* (exclamatory) and *mactus virtute esto*, and I suppose the retention of the vocative form would be thought to impart something of the explosiveness of the exclamatory clause. So from *macte!* meaning substantially 'bravo!' we should have to fancy people beginning to say 'be thou bravo!' This is in itself difficult, and when now one takes into account the older use of the phrase it becomes wellnigh incredible.

The oldest use is sacrificial. *Mactus* means, I take it, 'increased,' 'magnified,' 'glorified,' from root *mag*.¹ Servius tells us that the expression was derived from the religious language, and we find it repeatedly used in the prayers given by Cato in his work *De Re Rustica*, as follows: *macte fercto esto; macte vino inferio esto; macte hisce suovitaurilibus lactentibus immolandis esto*; and the like (chapters 132, 134, 139, 141). What would the vocative be doing here? *Macte* here does not mean 'bravo!' nor is there anything exclamatory or interjectional in the thought; it is not even 'O glorious Jove'; it is simply 'be thou magnified by these offerings,' always at the end of the prayer, and in a solemn but tranquil tone. Nor does the vocative of the god's name immediately precede; this may or may not be the case.

¹ Fest. p. 125, *mactus, magis auctus*. Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 9, 641, *macte, magis aucte, affectatae gloriae: et est sermo tractus a sacris, quotiens enim aut tus aut vinum super victimam fundebatur, dicebant, mactus est taurus vino vel ture: hoc est, cumulata est hostia et magis aucta*. But the usage shows that *mactus* was said rather of the god than the victim.

Now, dissent from this vocative view has not been altogether wanting. As early as 1827 G. T. A. Krüger, in his 'Untersuchungen aus dem Gebiete der lateinischen Sprachlehre,' Heft 3, p. 80, separated *macte* from the above-described cases of attraction, and recognized in it an adverb. Madvig says: "man pflegt dies wort mit unrecht als den vocativ eines sonst ungebräuchlichen adjectivs zu betrachten" (Grammar, § 268, a, 3 foot-note), but he does not tell us what it is. Weissenborn on Livy 2, 12, 14, calls it an adverb; and Roby (516), speaking of the shortening of the adverb-ending *-ē* in *bēnē*, *mālē*, adds with a 'perhaps' *mactē*. Roby is certainly wrong in classing *macte* with *bene* and *male*. In the shortening of the latter, two influences have co-operated: the well-known tendency to shorten iambic words to pyrrhics, and the frequency of these particular words. *Macte* is not a frequent word, and not an iambic word, and so it is hardly credible that as an adverb it should have been shortened, or should have a short *-ē* at all.

Now, if we examine the three passages, which, so far as I can find out, are the only evidence we have of the quantity of *macte*, we find, what nobody seems to have noticed, that there is in these no *esto* at all, and that nothing hinders our taking it outright as vocative. The chief passage is Verg. Aen. 9, 641. Ascanius has just killed Remulus with his arrow, and Apollo watching the conflict calls out *macte nova virtute puer; sic itur ad astra*, which is to say, 'bravo, boy, for thy youthful prowess; 'tis thus that immortality is gained.' The two other places are both in Statius' *Silvae*: 1, 2, 201, *macte toris*, *Laios inter placidissime vates*, and 1, 3, 106, *macte bonis animi*. And this leads me to my own view, which is that there are two *macte*'s: *mactē* vocative, used in pure exclamations, and *mactē* adverb, used in wishes along with *esto*. There occur also *mactus* nominative singular, *mactum* accusative, and *macti* nominative plural of this obsolescent word; and to make all clearer I will run through the bulk of the instances where the different forms occur.

1. The nominative *mactus* in a formula of Cato's (R. R. 134), *bonas preces precor, uti sies volens propitius mihi, liberisque meis, domo familiaeque meae, mactus hoc fercto*, 'glorified by this meat-offering.' Again along with *esto* in a sentence from a similar prayer, Arnobius 7, 31, *mactus hoc vino inferio esto*, where Cato in like cases gives *macte*; whence we see that *mactus esto* was said as well as *macte esto*.

2. The accusative, *mactum honoratumque*, in a Numidian inscription: see Neue II, p. 99.

3. The adverb *mactē*; first in the sacrificial formulae above described: *macte vino inferio esto*, and the like. *Macte esse* can be said just as *bene, pulcre esse*, which Plautus freely uses personally (*bene fui, pulcre simus*, etc.; Men. 485; Truc. 4, 2, 28; Merc. 3, 3, 21), 'to be well off'; so *macte esse*, 'to be in a glorified condition.' Later in expressions of applause and encouragement with *esto*, and with an ablative, mostly *virtute*. *Macte virtute esto* (Hor. Sat. 1, 2, 31; Sen. Ep. 66 end), 'be prospered' or 'increased in thy valor'; *macte virtute diligentiaque esto* (Liv. 10, 40, 11); *macte, inquam, virtute simulque his versibus esto* (Lucilius). Add Mart. 4, 13; Pacuv. v. 146 Ribbeck. In indirect discourse Liv. 2, 12, 14, *iuberem (te) macte virtute esse*, where the assumption of a vocative would be more than ever troublesome. A case with the plural will be noted directly.

4. The vocative *mactē*; without *esto*. In a fragment of Attius' Neoptolemus (v. 473 R.), *tū, uti dixi, macte his armis, macta virtutem patris*, 'thou who art honored with these arms, do honor to thy sire's valor.' Again Attius (v. 305 R.), *maneds, his ante exilio macte Pelopiis ex terris!* where it seems to be ironical, 'honored with exile.' Later in exclamations of applause. Simply *macte* 'bravo!' (Cic. Att. 15, 29, 3; Fragm. of unc. trag. v. 231 R.; Val. Flac. 6, 547): *macte virtute* (Cic. Att. 12, 6, 2; Tusc. 1, 17, 40): *macte uterque ingenti in rem publicam merito* (Plin. Pan. 89), 'bravo, both of them!': *macte animo* (Stat. Theb. 7, 280): *macte hac gloria* (Plin. Pan. 46). The Vergilian passage and the two from Statius' *Silvae* have been quoted already. Exceptionally we find *macte* with the genitive, Mart. 12, 6, *macte animi . . . morumque tuorum*; and Stat. Theb. 2, 495; with an exclamatory accusative, Flor. 2, 18, *macte fortissimam et . . . beatissimam . . . civitatem*. In all these cases there is no need of supposing that *esto* or anything else is understood.

5. The plural *macti*, read at present only Plin. H. N. 2, 12, 9, *macti ingenio este*; and Curt. 4, 1, 18, *vos quidem macti virtute, inquit, estote*; which used, I dare say, to be taken as vocative, but on our theory will be nominative, corresponding to the *mactus* . . . *esto* furnished by Arnobius. Formerly *macti virtute inquit, milites Romani, este* was read in Liv. 7, 36, 5, but now Alschefski, Madvig and Weissenborn have replaced *macte* on manuscript authority. And it is noteworthy that in both the above passages of Pliny and Curtius, *macte* is found as a manuscript variant. If this reading is right, it seems to dispose finally of the

vocative theory, as *macte* vocative singular could not be used in addressing more than one person.

This theory of two different *macte*'s I would put forward with all due caution, as accounting best for the facts so far as I know them. It would be overthrown if it should be shown that *macte* with *esto* has anywhere a short *e*; it would be confirmed if it could be shown that it has a long *e*. But I have not been able to find any case of either.

7.—*Temperare*.

This verb certainly comes from *tempus*, whose stem *tempo-* appears in the form *tempes-* in *temperi* (locative) and *tempes-tas*. But to trace its meaning is less easy. The way, however, has been paved for this by a brief but suggestive discussion of *tempus* and *templum* by Usener in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, vol. 117, p. 59. To reproduce the argument in full would be out of place here; its conclusion is that *tempus* meant primarily 'place cut off,' 'space marked off,' and was applied especially to sacred enclosures on the earth and the sacred augural divisions of the heavens—in short, meant precisely what *templum* afterwards came to mean. The word referred originally to *space*; the meaning 'time' is later, and came about in this way: the quarters of the heavens are thought of as corresponding to and standing for the parts of the day and year; east is morning, south noon, and so on; so *diei tempus* was originally the quarter of the sky where the sun stood. *Templum* (Plaut. *ex tempulo*) Usener takes for **tempus-lum*,¹ a diminutive of *tempus*; which evidently succeeded to its local use when *tempus* itself took on the temporal meaning. Not the least valuable part of Usener's article is the identification of *tempus* with the Greek τέμπη (= **τέμπεσ-α*, *tempor-a*), which contains precisely the same stem *tempes-*. The old meaning of τέμπη is shown to be 'sacred enclosures,' 'sacred groves' (= τεμένη).² The root is *tem-p-*; *tem-* 'cut' with a determinative *p*.³ It had been already sug-

¹ That *templum* stands for **tem-ulum*, **temlum*, with inserted *p*, as has been often represented, last by Vaniček, is disproved by *temp-ulum*. This form shows that the *p* is not there to keep *m* and *l* apart.

² Schol. Theoc. 1, 66: τέμπη γενικῶς μὲν τὰ ἄλση. Hesych.: τέμπη· τὰ σύνδενδρα χωρία. It is known that the name was not confined to the celebrated Thessalian valley.

³ Fick and Vaniček assume *tan-p-*, 'stretch': so make *tempus* = 'span,' and so 'time.' Others have connected it with *tap-*, 'warm' (*tep-or*); L. Meyer with *τόπος*. All three views are to be given up.

gested that *tempus* meant 'place,' and L. Meyer¹ had interpreted *ex tempore* as 'from the spot,' 'von der stelle aus,' 'auf der stelle,' just like *ex templo*. And *tempora*, 'temples' of the head, (this Usener does not mention) explain themselves as the 'spots,' 'places,' that is, the vital, tender spots. This etymology of *tempus* seems to me as clearly made out as anything need be, and it affords us an interesting glimpse into Graeco-italic religious notions. The older meaning peeps out in *anni tempora* (Lucret.), 'seasons' of the year, *extremum diei tempus*, *matutina tempora* (Cic.), and like expressions: compare *templa caeli* (Enn.), 'quarters' of the sky.

Now, of these two meanings of *tempus*, 'bounded space,' 'place,' and 'time,' which appears in *temperare*? The latter not at all, for *temperare* never has any reference to time. The verb arose and developed its meaning altogether from the older *tempus* of local signification. Conceivable meanings for such a verb would be (1) 'mark off into *tempora*, limited spaces'; (2) 'assign bounds, limited space, to'; (3) 'keep something within *tempora* or bounds'; or (4) intransitively, 'keep one's self in bounds.' Of these possible turns, only the three last distinctly appear; of the first I do not find trustworthy indications.²

'Restrain' is the commonest meaning of the verb, and the only one known to the earlier Latinity.³ Both the dative and the accusative constructions easily explain themselves, as do the same two constructions with *moderari*. *Temperare linguae, manibus, aetati* is to 'set bounds to tongue,' 'hands,' 'youthful passion'; *temperare vim, sumptus, libertatem, annonam*, is, with a slightly dif-

¹ Vergl. Gramm. I, 368.

² As an augural term the first supposed meaning would be very natural; *temperare locum*, 'mark it off into a *templum*'; or *temperare caelum*; and so it might pass into metaphorical use. One is tempted to recognize this in expressions like *temperare orbem* (Ovid Metam. I, 770; 15, 869), said of the Sun and Augustus; *Iuppiter arces temperat aetherias* (Ov. Metam. 15, 858); and Horace's *qui mare ac terras variisque mundum temperat horis* (Carm. I, 12, 15); an unknown comic poet (Suet. Oct. 68) wrote *viden ut cinaedus orbem digito temperat*? But against this is the fact that this use is not to be traced in pre-Augustan literature: so in all probability these seeming indications are illusory, and we have here merely an offshoot of the meaning 'restrain.'

³ Plautus has *temperare* eight times: twice with dative, three times with infinitive, twice absolute, once with *ne* and subjunctive. Terence has only *temperans* twice. An uncertain tragic poet (Cic. Div. I, 21, 42) has *temperaret tollere*. Lucretius does not use the word.

ferent turn, to 'keep violence, expenses, freedom, price of corn, within limits.' Then 'govern,' 'control,' *temperare ora, rem publicam*. This accusative construction I cannot directly exemplify from early Latin, but it seems to be implied in *temperatus, temperate*, used by Cato. Furthermore, this last *temperare* is capable of being taken reflexively or intransitively: 'keep *one's self* within bounds'; so *posthac temperabo*, 'I'll be moderate hereafter';¹ *temperare in amore*;² with infinitive, *temperare dormire*³ and the like, not infrequently, 'refrain'; later with ablative, *temperare a lacrimis*, etc. So, too, *temperans* as adjective, as early as Terence.

From this meaning 'restrain,' 'keep within bounds,' comes a rich metaphorical development: I mean the usage of *temperare* in the sense of 'apportion,' 'mix in due proportion.' I am aware that the dictionaries have long represented this as the first and fundamental meaning of the verb, and at first I was tempted to get this directly from a supposed *tempus* 'division,' which would be the oldest sense of the noun. But there are two weighty reasons against this. First, *temperare* in this sense is not found before Cicero; secondly, *tempus*, so far as our indications show, meant always a division of *space*, 'space cut off,' not a 'division' outright. So I now feel sure that this sense is a derived one. The starting-point for this usage I take to be the tempering of cold water with hot, or hot with cold; this was 'restraining' it within due bounds—*temperare calorem, frigus*. So on to *temperare solem umbra, temperatura caeli, intemperiae*, and other terms applying to atmospheric heat or cold. And from water again it was an easy step to *temperare pocula, venenum, aes*, etc.; till at last it was felt outright as 'mix,' and we have *temperare colores* (Plin.), *herbas* (in a healing salve, Ovid); and Cicero says *temperare acuta cum gravibus*, and *ex dissimilibus rebus misceri et temperari*.⁴

Accordingly we have, recounting briefly:

1. *temperare*, 'set bounds to' (dative).
2. *temperare*, 'keep within bounds' (acc.), and, derived from this, 'apportion,' 'mix.'
3. *temperare*, 'restrain one's self within bounds.'

The compound *obtemperare* presents, however, a fresh problem. I have not been able to satisfy myself in getting the sense 'yield,' 'comply,' out of the *temperare* above described. 'Restrain one's

¹ Plaut. Trin. 1187.

² Plaut. Epid. I, 2, 8.

³ Prol. Plaut. Poen. 24.

⁴ Rep. 6, 18, 18; Off. 3, 13, 119.

self in another's presence ' seems unsatisfactory ; it is too far from the actual sense. Can it be that we have yet another *temperare* here ? I will venture on two slightly different suggestions. From *χωρος* the verb *χωρεῖν* means ' move,' *cedere*—advance or retreat. Could we fancy that *temperare* was ever used in the same sense, then *obtemperare* would be parallel to *ἐπιχωρεῖν* : it would mean primarily *accedere*, ' come at one's call ' ; *ob* having its old force of *ad*. It would, therefore, be like *pārere*, originally ' sich einstellen,' ' present one's self ' ;¹ and *obsequi*. Or—another possibility—we might suppose a phrase *ob tempore*, ' on the spot ' (compare *op-pido*, that is *ob pedo*, ' on a level '), and thence an adjective **obtemperus*, whence *obtemperare*, with the meaning ' present one's self,' ' be on hand.' Is it perhaps conceivable that *obtemperare* was originally an augural term, applied to the birds or other signs that showed themselves in the ' fields ' (*templa* or *tempora*) of vision ? *Optemperare* in Plautus and Terence is always used of obeying the command of a *person* ; not yet, therefore, *obtemperare rationi* or *auctoritati*, or such turns. Noteworthy is Ter. Adelph. 705, where the son tells his father to make the prayers to the gods in his stead, ' because you are a much better man than I, and they will surely pay more attention to you (*tibi optemperaturos magis*) than to me.'

Contemperare, the only remaining compound, arises from *temperare*, ' mix,' and belongs to the later language.

8.—*Intrare*, *penetrare*.

To these words we must add *extrare*, ' pass out,' in a verse of Afranius,² *simul limen intrabo, illi extrabunt ilico*.

Bopp³ divided *in-trare*, *pene-trare*, and recognized in the last part a primary verb **träre* (like *stäre*), which he connected with the Sanskrit root *tar-*, ' cross,' ' pass over,' and saw in *trans* the present participle thereof. Assent, so far as *intrare* is concerned, is expressed by Corssen ;⁴ G. Curtius, too, in his Greek Etymology understands *intrare* and *extrare* so ; and Vaniček⁵ gives all three verbs as compounds of **träre*. No other theory, so far as I know, has ever been given.

This view is attended with no difficulty or improbability except in the case of *penetrare*. As the first part of the supposed com-

¹ Vaniček, Etym. Wörterb., p. 503.

² V. 5 Ribbeck.

³ Gloss. Sanscr. I, p. 165.

⁴ Zeitschr. für vergl. Sprachf., 3, p. 292.

⁵ Etym. Wört. p. 290.

pound must be *penus*, 'store' (of food),¹ and as a verb cannot be compounded with a noun-stem, we should be driven to assuming that the word is a juxtaposition of some case of *penus* and **trare*; and stands—say for *penum trare*, which would be like *vēnum ire* (*vēnire*), *vēnum dare* (*vendere*), but with this difference that it would show no trace of its original form, as two separate words, in the earlier language. This is a small difficulty; a greater one is the Plautine use *se penetrare*; for the active meaning of the verb accords ill with the meaning of *tar-* and **trare*.

Now, of course, the great mass of verbs in *-are* are of denominative origin, and if it be shown that there existed in Latin noun-stems in *-o-* corresponding to each of the three verbs in question, will it not be far more likely that the verbs are simply derived from these nouns and do not contain any **trare* at all?

To *extrare* we have the stem *extero-* in *exterus*, syncopated in the adverb *extrā* (for *exterā*), ablative feminine. It is from *ex*, with comparative suffix *-tero-*.

In like manner *intrā-* is ablative of a stem **intero-* (whence also *inter*, *inter-ior*, *internus*, like *exterior* and *externus*), corresponding to Greek ἐντερο- (τὰ ἔντερα, 'insides'). This, too, is a comparative formation, from *in*.

The noun-stem **penetro-* is proved by *penetralis*. The very numerous formations in *-ālis* are all denominative. The only ones I can find (I have to rely on Roby's and Leo Meyer's lists, as I have no absolutely complete collection of them) which are not clearly derived from existing nouns, are *vectigalis*, *fetialis*, *maialis*, *sodalis*, *canalis*, and perhaps *esurialis*; none of these has any connection with a verb in *-āre*, and there is no doubt that they are to be referred to lost nouns. *Penetralis* cannot, therefore, come from *penetrare*, but points unmistakably to a noun-stem **penetro-*. As to the meaning of this stem, we shall not be far wrong in assuming it to be 'inmost part' (of the house), comparing the adjective stem *penito-* and the adverb *peni-tus*. These are thought to come from *penus*, 'store,' 'store-room.' The suffix *-tro-* may or may not be the comparative *-tero-*.

We derive, therefore,

<i>extrare</i>	from	stem	<i>ex-t(e)ro-</i> ;
<i>intrare</i>	"	"	<i>*in-t(e)ro-</i> ;
<i>penetrare</i>	"	"	<i>*pene-tro-</i> ;

¹ Curt. Etym.³ p. 254; Vaniček, p. 449.

just like *superare* from stem *supero-*. The meaning of all these was apparently causative at first: so *se superare*, 'put one's self above' (*radius sese sol superabat ex mari*, Plaut. Stich. 365); *se penetrare*, 'put one's self inside' (*intra pectus se penetravit potio*, Truc. 1, 1, 23; so very often in Plautus¹); and presumably *se intrare* and *se extrare*, though these are not known. From this they came to be used intransitively, 'get above,' 'get inside,' etc.; and finally to take the accusative of that which is surmounted or entered; but *penetrare* and *intrare* are not so used in Plautus, who indeed has *intrare* but seldom.² The connexion between *intra* and *intrare* is further indicated by the frequency of *intra limen* on the one hand,³ and *intrare limen* on the other;⁴ while in the Menaechmi 414 we have *periisti si intrassis intra limen*.

Whether *trans* (Umbrian *traf*) is really the participle of a **trāre*, or that verb should be dispensed with altogether, I do not undertake to say.

FREDERIC D. ALLEN.

¹ For instance, Trin. 291, 314. Plautus has the intransitive *penetrare* only once, Bacch. 56. He has also *penetrare pedem*. In *penetrant se in fugam* (Amph. 250), and *se penetravit ex aedibus* (Trin. 276), the verb has come to mean no more than *praecipitare*, 'plunge.'

² Men. 414, Truc. 2, 1, 20.

³ Mil. Glor. 596, Cist. 3, 19, Most. 5, 1, 16.

⁴ Fragm. of Afranius quoted above; Cic. Phil. 2, 27, 68: other examples in the lexica.